

file copy

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

April 9, 1974

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Chairman Robert Alberti.
- II. An addendum was made to the minutes of March 12. (See Item VII-C below.)
- III. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:

Alberti, Robert	Fierstine, Harry	McCormac, Weston
Amazio, Joseph	Gold, Marcus	Nelson, Linden
Bailey, Roger	Graham, Priscilla	Nielsen, Keith
Behman, Sara	Greffinius, Ruben	O'Leary, Michael
Burroughs, Sarah	Harden, Sheldon	Rhoads, Howard
Burton, Robert	Hariri, Mahmud	Roberts, Alice
Clerkin, Ed	Hendricks, Francis	Rogalla, John
Coyes, Frank	Hooks, Robert	Rosen, Arthur
Delany, James	Johnson, Corwin	Sandlin, Doral
Eatough, Norman	Krupp, William	Saveker, David
Emmel, James R.	Labhard, Lezlie	Scales, Harry
	Lau, James	Scheffer, Paul
	Markos, Harry	Sorensen, Robert

Sullivan, Gerald
Weatherby, Joseph
Wenzl, Michael
Wills, Max

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS:
(Voting)

Anderson, Roy
Andreini, Robert
Fischer, Jeff
Gibson, J. Cordner
Loudon, Michael
Olsen, Barton

Servatius, Owen
Whitson, Milo

GUESTS:

Camacho, Christina
Evans, Handel
Gerard, Doug
Ward, Wes
Weber, Barbara

IV. Committee Reports

- A. Vice President for Academic Affairs Selection Consultative Committee - Wes Ward, Chairman
Of the 21 candidates now being considered for the position, six are in-state in our system. Also in this group of 21 are highly qualified women and representatives of minority groups. The in-state candidates are being interviewed here, while out-of-state people are participating in preliminary interviews by means of conference calls.
- B. Selection Committee for Dean, School of Business and Social Sciences - Bob Hooks for Les Vanoncini, Chairman
The Committee has received 111 applications and has narrowed these down to 31. People indicated by the prospect as references are now being contacted, and after reviewing those responses, the list of candidates will be reduced to about 12. Those 12 will be asked to visit the campus for more interviewing. The Committee expects to have six names to present to President Kennedy by May 1, 1974.
- C. Budget Committee - Ed Clerkin, Chairman
Mr. Clerkin explained that the Committee was charged in the Fall Quarter of the 1973-74 academic year with the responsibility of investigating, documenting and reporting on implementation of the 60/40 rule regarding promotions at Cal Poly. He distributed to Senate members a copy of the questions which his Committee directed to certain individuals on campus, together with the responses which were received. (See Attachment IV-C.)
Questions 1 and 2 still have not been answered, and the Senate requested that the Budget Committee pursue answers at the departmental level.
- D. Curriculum Committee - Joe Weatherby, Chairman
The Committee presented the following curriculum proposals for the schools indicated:

1. School of Human Development and Education

The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate supports the proposals and amendments submitted by the School of Human Development and Education provided the following Committee recommendations are also included:

Child Development - Defer action until submission of revised proposals

Ed 139 Exploring Education Field Experience (3-5) - Approved by a vote of 4 in favor, 2 opposed, and one abstention

HE 587 Seminar in Family Housing (3) - Defer action until consultation with Architecture

HE 536 Experimental Studies in Household Equipment (3) - Defer action until consultation with Electrical Engineering

HE 409 Furniture Design - Defer action until title and description changes clarified

Liberal Studies revisions approved with the Committee's suggestion that the senior project Hum 461, 462, 463 be changed so that both the directing instructor and his department will receive credit for work performed. This will require a subject prefix change; e.g. Hum 461 to Math 461 if the project is in Mathematics.

2. School of Architecture and Environmental Design

The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate supports the proposals and amendments submitted by the School of Architecture and Environmental Design provided the following Committee recommendations are also included:

CRP 218 Environmental Planning Management Policy - (new course) - Defer action until clarification of course description

CRP 365 Transportation Theory - (new course) - Defer action until further consultation with Transportation Department

3. School of Business and Social Sciences

The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate supports the proposals and amendments submitted by the

School of Business and Social Sciences provided the following Committee recommendations are also included:

- Soc 333 Social Research Methods - (new course) - Defer action until clarification of course description and course prerequisites
- Soc 440 Supervised Field Work - (significant non-editorial change) - Defer action until justification of unit increase
- Soc 431 Population Problems - (significant non-editorial change) - Defer action until clarification of prerequisites

4. School of Science and Mathematics

The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate now supports the following proposals, as amended, submitted by the School of Science and Mathematics:

Approve name change from School of Science and Mathematics to School of Science.

Bio 313 Radiation Biology - Approved 4-1-74

Ent 126 General Entomology - Approved 4-1-74

CSc 435 Computer Systems Principles - Approved 4-1-74

It was moved and seconded (Weatherby/Sullivan) that the Senate endorse and forward to the President the curriculum proposal for the School of Human Development and Education as presented by the Curriculum Committee. The motion passed.

It was moved and seconded (Weatherby/Sullivan) that the Senate endorse and forward to the President the curriculum proposal for the School of Architecture as presented by the Curriculum Committee. The motion passed.

It was moved and seconded (Weatherby/Sullivan) that the Senate endorse and forward to the President the curriculum proposal for the School of Business and Social Sciences as presented by the Curriculum Committee. It was moved and seconded (Anderson/Burroughs) to amend the motion so as to defer action on the "Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management" portion of the proposal for this school. The amendment passed with one abstention after Senate members decided that more consultation from faculty members of that school was in order. The amended main motion passed.

It was moved and seconded (Weatherby, Sullivan) to endorse and forward to the President the formerly deferred items specified in above section IV.D.4 of the School of Science and Mathematics. It was moved and seconded (Whitson/Johnson) that the motion be amended to defer the name change as suggested for the School of Science and Mathematics. The amendment passed unanimously. The amended main motion passed with one abstention.

E. Election Committee - Bob Hooks, Chairman

No nominees have been received for Senate offices and membership of the Executive Committee. Faculty members prefer to wait until after the regular election for senators which will be held Tuesday, April 16 from 0800 to 1700. At that election the Personnel Review Committee representatives and CSUC Academic Senator will also be chosen.

G. Personnel Policies Committee - Frank Coyes, Chairman

1. A subcommittee has been formed to investigate steady state staffing and its relation to faculty recruitment, promotions, etc.
2. The Personnel Policies Committee is presenting today the following items for consideration: Faculty Evaluation/CAM; Appointment of Instructional Department Heads.
3. The Committee is continuing study on Faculty Evaluation by Students in relation to its use in retention, promotion, and tenure.

H. Student Affairs Committee - Doral Sandlin, Chairman

1. After considering the item of "Student Academic Advisement", the Committee decided that an in-depth study was necessary. Dean Chandler has agreed to make available a person to conduct an operations-analysis type study for the purpose of identifying the steps involved and also the best way for achieving the best coordination between the groups and individuals. The results will be submitted to the Committee for consideration, and at that time the Committee will make a recommendation to the Senate.
2. Concerning revisions to Administrative Bulletin 68-10, Athletic Policy and Procedures, the Committee considered only those items that related to faculty involvement, student welfare, and academic standards. In the area of faculty involvement, the Athletic Advisory Commission membership would include a representative appointed by the Chairman of the Academic Senate. This provision was endorsed by the Student Affairs Committee. In the area of student welfare, the Committee felt that a statement should be included stating that the student athlete should receive guidance and encouragement to achieve an academic (degree) objective from Cal Poly.

It was moved and seconded (Sandlin/Andreini) to endorse the Student Affairs Committee's report that a statement be included in the revisions to the Athletic Policy and Procedures to the effect that the student athlete receive guidance and encouragement to achieve a degree from Cal Poly, and that an Academic Senate representative be included in the membership of the Athletic Advisory Commission. The motion carried.

I. General Education Committee - Paul Scheffer, Chairman

Suggestions have been received by the Committee from various faculty members for modifications in the general education requirements. Hopefully by the end of this month, the Committee will submit a statement to the Executive Committee for possible consideration by the Academic Senate.

J. Personnel Review Committee - Thomas Johnston, Chairman (Report read by Chairman Alberti)

An analysis of promotion recommendations received from the seven schools and administrative affairs shows that there are 73 cases of disagreement in which a faculty member received either a total negative vote at all levels of review, or received a recommendation which displayed disagreement at one or two levels of review. Twenty-four of the cases sighted were in the 60/40 category and in view of the Assembly Concurrent Resolution ACR 70, the Committee requested approval by the President for the following action:

"That all promotion recommendations dependent on the 60/40 quota be tabled at the present time and that the Committee reserves the option for subsequent review on such cases should further action prove necessary." Vote - Unanimous

In keeping with current Committee procedures each faculty member was personally contacted and in addition received a letter from the Committee seeking a response on whether a review would be requested. The Personnel Review Committee has received 19 requests for review and expects to complete all reviews by the stated deadline of April 10. It should be noted that out of the balance of the non or split recommendations of which there are 54, seventeen faculty members acknowledged the communication from this Committee and returned the letter indicating a review would not be requested. The balance, 37 in number, have given no indication of intent or acknowledgement of the Committee communication.

K. Research Committee - David Saveker, Chairman

1. The Committee will probably recommend no CARE grants this quarter in order to ensure operating funds for the Research Office.
2. A grant has been received by the School of Agriculture for studies and experiments in food dehydration.
3. A draft has been prepared of a faculty handbook which explains how to apply for and write a proposal for research grants.
4. A CAM revision is being considered relative to the Interim Policy on Faculty Consulting and Overload.

L. Library Committee

Chairman Alberti announced that the resolution endorsed for the Committee concerning inter-library cooperation has been forwarded by the President to the Chancellor.

M. Ad-Hoc Traffic Management Committee - Ruben J. Greffenius, Academic Senate Representative (See Attachment IV-M.)

A report was distributed to members relative to the abuse of parking privileges on campus. Particular attention was directed to the recommendation to implement the following policy not later than the start of Fall Quarter, 1974:

If a vehicle is parked illegally, including those areas where appropriate signs are required and posted, a citation should be issued and the vehicle subsequently towed away.

V. Business Items**A. Bylaws Amendment - Second Reading (See Item IV-D of Academic Senate Minutes 3/12/74 and Attachment III-A of the Academic Senate Agenda, April 9, 1974.)**

It was moved and seconded (Johnson/Hendricks) that the Senate Bylaws, Section VII.B.1 be amended as presented at the March 12, 1974, Senate meeting (as printed in the minutes, Item IV-D, of March 12, 1974) with editorial changes, Numbers 1, 2, 4, and 6, as recommended by the Executive Committee (Attachment III-A of the Academic Senate Agenda for April 9, 1974). It was moved and seconded (Rosen, Scheffer) to amend the motion by including in the bylaws amendment Section 1c (Number 3) as proposed by the Executive Committee in Attachment III-A of the Academic Senate Agenda of April 9, 1974. The amendment passed (31 to 11, 2 abstentions). It was moved and seconded (Burton/Rosen) to amend the motion by including in the bylaws amendment Section 1e (Number 5) as proposed by the Executive Committee in Attachment III-A of the Academic Senate Agenda of April 9, 1974. The amendment passed (25 to 14, 4 abstentions). The amended main motion carried, endorsing the proposed Bylaws change, including the Executive Committee recommendations.

B. Deferred Items

Due to time limitation, the following items were deferred until the next meeting:

1. Final Examination Policy
2. Bookstore Policy on Faculty Nonpublished Materials
3. Faculty Evaluation/CAM

At the request of the Personnel Policies Committee, the item concerning "Appointment of Instructional Department Heads/CAM" was also deferred:

VI. Discussion Items**A. Capital Outlay Priorities - Doug Gerard, Executive Dean, Facilities Planning (See Attachment VI- .)**

Mr. Gerard explained the proposed five-year capital outlay program, copies of which were distributed to Senate members.

B. Directions Committee Report

Due to time limitation, the report will be considered at the next meeting.

VII. Announcements and Reports

A. Jeff Fischer was introduced as the new ASI President's proxy on the Academic Senate, replacing Rob Chappel, who has left school this quarter.

B. The Executive Committee at its last meeting expressed concern over the Academic Council's recent decision to schedule classes at 11:00 on Tuesdays. A copy of the Executive Committee's resolution which has been

transmitted to the President appears in the minutes of the March 28 Executive Committee meeting.

- C. In reference to the proposed new grievance procedures which were received from the CSUC Senate office and included in the Academic Senate minutes of March 12, our office has received from the statewide Senate office an addendum which should be included at the bottom of page 6. It reads as follows:

3.10.3.2 A yes vote, whether or not qualified, is a vote for the grievant; a no vote, whether or not qualified, is a vote against the grievant.

- D. There will be a series of Collective Bargaining Seminars held in May. Hopefully the schedule will be as follows:

Wednesday, May 1, 3 p.m.

Collective Bargaining: The Issue

Pro: "Mac" Larsen, Secretary, CSUC Academic Senate

Con: Clay Sommers, CSUC Dean, Faculty Affairs

Wednesday, May 8, 3 p.m.

Collective Bargaining: The Membership Organizations

Representatives of AAUP, ACSUP, CCUFA, CSEA, UPC

Wednesday, May 15, 3 p.m.

Collective Bargaining: An Analysis

Sara Behman, Associate Professor of Economics

Homer Hoyt, Associate Professor of Education

- E. President Kennedy has not yet acted on the Department Head Evaluation. He is now receiving input from department heads.

- F. The catalog faculty directory proposal has been approved by the President; his response was as follows:

"At the recommendation of the Academic Council, I am approving the Academic Senate's proposal to include faculty ranks in the faculty and staff directory of the University Catalog. The inclusion of faculty ranks will be implemented in the 1975-77 edition of the Catalog. One of the questions which will need to be addressed in the implementation of this recommendation is the listing of classifications or titles for student affairs officers, librarians, and other academically related classifications currently listed in the directory. Any suggestions the Senate wishes to make regarding the method of listing these individuals in the faculty and staff directory would be appreciated.

Following the Academic Council's recommendation of April 2, 1973, an addition to section 490 of CAM was approved with regard to listing faculty and staff in the University Catalog. Section 490.6, including the Academic Senate's proposed revision, as quoted below will be included in the next CAM Change:

490.6 Catalog Directory

The directory of faculty and staff is a listing of the tenured and probationary professional personnel of the university and its auxillary organizations who are employed half time or more. Individuals on temporary or limited term appointments (i.e. substitutes, temporary leave replacements, lecturers, etc.) will not be listed in the Catalog Directory unless their appointments as future tenured or probationary employees have been documented by Catalog press proof time.

A brief biography citing academic degree, professional licenses granted by a governmental agency, certification by a professional association, and professional experience directly related to the appointment accompanies each faculty and staff listing."

- G. There will be a special meeting of the Academic Senate on Tuesday, April 23, in the Staff Dining Room at 3:15 p.m. in order to deal with the items that were deferred at this meeting.
- H. Barton Olsen, statewide Academic Senator, reported that a new Executive Order on Grievance Procedures is expected to be issued by the Chancellor's Office by the middle of the month, despite the unresolved disagreements between the Chancellor's staff and the CSUC Senate.
- I. The Distinguished Teaching Awards plaques will be displayed in the University Union so students can view them more easily.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Memorandum

To : Dr. Robert Alberti
Chairman, Academic Senate

Date : March 29, 1974

File No.:

Copies : Senate Budget Committee

From : Senate Budget Committee
Ed Clerkin, Chairman *Ed*

Subject: Status Report - Consideration of 60/40 rule at Cal Poly

In the Fall Quarter of the 1973-74 Academic year, the Senate Budget Committee was charged with the responsibility of investigating, documenting and reporting on implementation of the 60/40 rule regarding promotions at Cal Poly.

From the outset, the Committee was ineffective in establishing regular meetings due to teaching schedule conflicts and the changing membership of the Committee. As a result, the first meeting of the Budget Committee did not take place until late in the Winter Quarter. This will partially account for our apparent delay in reporting this item out of the Committee at this late date.

The Committee directed its efforts to attempt to obtain meaningful answers to the following specific questions as they apply to 60/40 at Cal Poly.

1. A record of departmental promotion recommendations which were not honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations, for 1972-73 and 1973-74.
2. Departments where promotional recommendations for 1974-75 will not be honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations.
3. How much money is requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1974-75 budget and how was this figure calculated?
4. How much money was requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1972-73 and 1973-74 budget and how were these figures calculated?
5. For the periods 1972-73 and 1973-74, how much money has been spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to Full Professors (or equivalent)?
6. In the 1974-75 budget, how much money will be spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent)?
7. For the period 1972 to 1974 and 1974-75, how much "promotion money" has been used to make up salary savings?

Attachments I and II indicate the recipient of specific questions of this group, while attachments III and IV indicate their replies to these specific questions. However, information vitally relevant to Questions #1 and #2 of this report had and still remain unanswered.

Accordingly, Attachment V was generated and transmitted in a further attempt to obtain specific answers to Questions #1 and #2, as well as the criteria used in establishing the promotion estimations contained in Attachment IV, since the latter information was not voluntarily submitted.

Further Committee action will be held in abeyance pending receipt of a definitive reply to Attachment V on both inquiries. The answers to Questions #1 and #2 may ultimately have to be obtained at the Department and Dean level of the individual Schools. The criteria aspect may remain forever a mystery.

Dr. Clyde P. Fisher
Academic Vice President

February 4, 1974

E. J. Clerkin
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee

Consideration of 60/40 Limitations

To assist the Senate Budget Committee in the preparation of its report to the Academic Senate on the consideration of the 60/40 rule, the following information is desired.

1. A record of departmental promotion recommendation which were not honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations, for 1972-73 and 1973-74.
2. Departments where promotional recommendations for 1974-75 will not be honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations.

If the above information has not been compiled to date, perhaps a memo to the School Deans would generate the desired information.

ATTACHMENT IV-C

ATTACHMENT I

James Landreth
Director of Business Affairs

February 4, 1974

E. J. Clerkin
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee

Consideration of 60/40 Rule

To assist the Senate Budget Committee in the preparation of its report to the Academic Senate on the consideration of the 60/40 rule, the following information is desired.

1. How much money is requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1974-75 budget and how was this figure calculated?
2. How much money was requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1972-73 and 1973-74 budget and how were these figures calculated?
3. For the periods 1972-73 and 1973-74, how much money has been spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to full Professors (or equivalent)?
4. In the 1974-75 budget, how much money will be spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to full Professors (or equivalent)?
5. For the period 1972 to 1974 and 1974-75, how much "promotion money" has been used to make up salary savings?

ATTACHMENT II

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Memorandum

To : E. J. Clerkin
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee

Date : February 11, 1974

File No.:

Copies : President Kennedy
Dr. Robert Alberti
School Deans
Mr. Donald Shelton

From : Clyde P. Fisher

Subject: Consideration of 60/40 Limitations

Your memo of February 4, 1974, regarding the subject-item requested information about "departmental promotion recommendation(s) which were not honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations, for 1972-73 and 1973-74...and will not be honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations for 1974-75."

As you surmised, the requested information is not available to me. Copies of this memo have been made for the School Deans and others shown as receiving copies of this memo.

I personally doubt if the information would be available from anyone other than the individual departmental tenured committees, and even then I personally doubt if the data would have been compiled by such committees. As I am sure you realize, some departmental faculties have used the 60/40 limitation as a "doige" instead of facing the sticky qualitative problem regarding promotions. Some departments have agreed not to make recommendations for promotion in order to provide opportunity for upcoming but not yet eligible, outstanding faculty members. The 60/40 limitation was often cited as the reason for making such deferrals. I trust that you will realize that the above comments are my personal observations only. It may be that the committee would be most likely able to obtain the desired information by direct faculty contact with the chairman of the tenured committee of each department. You will note that a copy has been made also for Mr. Shelton, Director of Personnel, in case such materials had previously been compiled.

ATTACHMENT III

Memorandum

To : Ed Clerkin, Chairman
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Date : March 5, 1974

File No.

Copies : D. Andrews
C. Fisher
D. Shelton
J. Surra

From : James R. Dendreth
Director of Business Affairs

Subject: Consideration of 60/40 Rule -- Budget Committee Questions

In answer to your questions presented in your February 4th memo to me, I asked Joseph Surra to work with Payroll and Personnel to accumulate the requested data.

In answer to Question No. 1, "How much money is requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1974-75 Budget and how was the figure calculated?", we interpret your request as promotions involving rank and class positions in Instruction in contrast to staff positions. There is \$51,460 budgeted for a total of 74 estimated promotions in 1974-75. This figure was calculated using Chancellor's Office promotion budget rates and Cal Poly's Personnel Office projections of promotions as shown in the table below. It should be noted that this calculation was done in August of 1973 and does not include salary increases.

Jr. to Intermediate	6 x \$550 = \$3,300
Intermediate to Senior	38 x \$515 = \$19,570
Senior to Principal	30 x \$953 = \$28,590
	<hr/> 74 \$51,460

In answer to Question No. 2, "How much money was requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1972-73 and 1973-74 Budget, and how were these figures calculated?", we have prepared the following tables:

1972-73 Budget

Jr. to Intermediate	2 x \$383 = \$ 766
Intermediate to Senior	28 x \$406 = \$11,368
Senior to Principal	31 x \$621 = \$19,251
	<hr/> 61 \$31,385

ATTACHMENT IV

Ed Clerkin
March 5, 1974
Page 2

1973-74 Budget

Jr. to Intermediate	2 x \$414 = \$ 824
Intermediate to Senior	40 x \$436 = \$17,440
Senior to Principal	23 x \$668 = \$15,364
	<hr/> 65 \$33,628

NOTE: All the figures as shown do not include Salary Increase funds.

In answer to Question No. 3, "For the periods 1972-73 and 1973-74, how much money has been spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to Full Professors (or equivalent)?", our Personnel records show the following figures including exempt time:

1972-73 - 23 promoted to Full Professor

1973-74 - 31 promoted to Full Professor

In answer to Question No. 4, "In the 1974-75 Budget, how much money will be spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to Full Professors (or equivalent)?", please refer to the last line of the table in answer to Question No. 1. The Personnel Office's best estimate in August of 1973 was that 30 promotions would be made to Full Professor.

In answer to Question No. 5, "For the period 1972 to 1974 and 1974-75, how much 'promotion money' has been used to make up Salary Savings?", we can, for all intentional purposes, say "none". This is because the rates presently used by the Chancellor's Office in budgeting for promotions do not generally match the promotion costs actually experienced by the University. For example, using the current salary scale, a promotion from Intermediate Voc. to Senior Voc. AY, \$1,094 to \$1,206, effective 9/1 costs \$1,120 versus the \$515 included in the 1974-75 Budget. Therefore at this campus, traditionally we need more promotion money than is available in the Budget.

Memorandum

To : Don Shelton
Director, Personnel Relations

Date : March 21, 1974

File No.:

Copies :

From : Ed Clerkin *EC*
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Consideration of 60/40 Limitations

Reference: (a) memo of Feb. 11, 1974 from Vice-President Fisher,
same subject.

(b) memo of March 5, 1974 from Jim Landreth,
same subject.

Reference (a) suggested I contact your office in the event the following
information has been compiled to date or is in the process of compilation.

1. A record of departmental promotion recommendations which were not
honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations, for 1972-73 and
1973-74.
2. Departments, where promotional recommendations for 1974-75 will not
be honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations.

Reference (b) outlines the number of estimated promotions and budget figures
for 1974-75, 1973-74 and 1972-73, but does not establish the criteria on
which these promotion estimations were made.

Perhaps you can provide the above information in order to assist the Senate
Budget Committee in the preparation of its report to the Academic Senate
on the consideration of the 60/40 rule.

ATTACHMENT V

Memorandum

ACADEMIC SENATE

To : Ed Clerkin, Chairman
Senate Budget Committee

APR 04 1974

Date : March 26, 1974

File No.:

CAL POLY - SLO

Copies : Robert E. Kennedy
Dale W. Andrews
Clyde P. Fisher
James Landreth
Robert Alberti
Thomas V. Johnston

From : Donald L. Shelton

Subject: CONSIDERATION OF 60/40 LIMITATIONS

This is in response to your memorandum of March 21, 1974, subject as
above. This office does not have a compilation of promotion recom-
mendations for years 1972-73 or 1973-74 which were not honored at
departmental or school level due to 60/40 limitations. I agree with
Vice President Fisher's comments of February 11 which suggested direct
contact with the chairmen of departmental tenured committees as the
most feasible source.

As you no doubt know, Assembly Concurrent Resolution 70 has been
recently passed by both houses of California Legislature as announced
Legislative intent to eliminate the "60-40 rule" in The California
State University and Colleges and base promotions on "merit". It is
my understanding that the staff of the Chancellor's Office are presently
working with the Department of Finance in order to administratively
implement the Legislative intent expressed in A.C.R. 70.

It is expected that such clarification will be received from the
Chancellor's Office prior to finalization of promotions for 1974-75.
As soon as information is received on this matter it will be provided to
the Academic Senate and publicized to all faculty.

With regard to your comment concerning "the criteria on which these
promotion estimations were made", the following comments may be helpful
to you. Each year during the initial budget preparation stage (normally
August for the budget effective July 1 of the subsequent year), a pro-
jection is made as to the number of promotions that may be made during
that time. In arriving at this estimate, consideration is given to past
promotion trends, estimates by the school deans as to the impact of
current year promotion cycle, newly authorized positions, known losses
such as resignations, non-reappointments, retirements, etc. and the
affect of the 60/40 rule. This estimate is then used by the Budget
Officer in developing the budget request for funds for faculty promotions.
In arriving at future projections, consideration will necessarily be given
to any administrative procedures developed by the Board of Trustees or the
Chancellor's Office as a result of adoption of Assembly Concurrent
Resolution 70.

If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me.

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Ad Hoc Traffic Management Committee

April 9, 1974

This campus-wide committee has met five times since the first of the year. The charge to the group was two-fold:

- (1) Developing a workable traffic management plan for the campus.
- (2) Analyzing the proposed master plan update as it relates to future traffic needs and management.

It is interesting to note that based upon a preliminary study of peak-loads, 1600 cars entered the campus on Grand Avenue and 1200 on California/Foothill Boulevard. Of these, only 20 per cent of the vehicles had more than one person in them.

Data from an engineering senior project revealed the following:

- (1) There is sufficient parking capacity to meet the demand during peak hours, although evidently not in the desired location.
- (2) There are approximately 375 to 400 vehicles parked illegally during peak hours on campus. This represents over 10% of the total capacity for parking.
- (3) Enforcement is no longer effective on this campus as a means of regulating parking. Whether this is due to lack of ticketing or lack of court action is not readily evident; however, without some immediate change, regulations will be of no value.

It was brought out at the last meeting that ticketing is not the problem. Citations were issued as follows:

July	848	November	2867
August	552	December	1506
September	761	January	3767
October	1745	February	3577

The problem appears to be follow-up on citations; processing of citations by the court in March, 1974, were those issued in October and November, 1972. In addition, 11 warrants were dismissed in February because they were over one year old.

Faculty, staff and students are equally guilty as to violations which consist of:

- (1) Stickers taped to windshields so that they can be moved from one vehicle to another.
- (2) No stickers.
- (3) Parking in wrong areas.
- (4) Parking in unauthorized areas such as red, yellow and paraplegic zones.
- (5) Blocking driveways and roadways.
- (6) Abuse of pool parking. Four cars in one pool on campus at same time; two of the cars were parked side by side.
- (7) Abuse of the second and third stickers issued to one individual; cars on campus at same time--one day 20 such violations were noted.

In view of the above, it has been recommended to implement the following policy not later than the start of Fall Quarter, 1974:

If a vehicle is parked illegally, including those areas where appropriate signs are required and posted, a citation should be issued and the vehicle subsequently towed away.

You should bear in mind that this recommendation is designed to achieve compliance with parking regulations; it does not constitute the entire job of the committee.

R. J. Greffenius
Academic Senate Representative
Ad Hoc Traffic Management Committee

PROPOSED FIVE-YEAR MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN LUIS OBISPO

DRAFT 3/74
TRUSTEES OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

PRIORITY NUMBER	PROJECT	CAPACITY	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
1	Crandall Gym Rehab	--	C 425,000	E 100,000			
2	Architecture CR Bldg	520	E 400,000	E 400,000			
3	Engineering South I	255	C 3,562,000	E 200,000	E 400,000	E 400,000	
4	Library-Fac Off Bldg	--	C 9,800,000		E 400,000	E 400,000	E 200,000
5	Life Science Bldg	729	C 5,647,000		E 400,000	E 300,000	
6	Classroom Bldg 3	Lec 176 Lab 48	PW 48,000	C 750,000	E 68,000		
7	Agriculture CR II	Lec 0 Lab 128	PW 155,000	C 2,726,000		E 450,000	
8	Site Develop 1975	--	PW 27,000	C 450,000			
9	Remodel Library	220		PW 45,000	C 800,000	E 350,000	

A = Acquisition E = Equipment W = Working Drawings C = Construction
P = Preliminary Plans
*Requested as part of Trustees' Budget and not included in the campus totals.

PPD 41
3/73

PROPOSED FIVE-YEAR MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN LUIS OBISPO

DRAFT 3/74
TRUSTEES OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

PRIORITY NUMBER	PROJECT	CAPACITY	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
10	Convert Science III	--		PW 100,000	C 1,750,000	E 400,000	E 200,000
11	Women's PE Addition	--		PW 27,000	C 480,000	E 75,000	
12	Site Develop 1976			PW 37,000	C 610,000		
13	Engineering South II	Lec 110 Lab 45			PW 170,000	C 2,600,000	E 400,000
14	Phys Ed Facilities	--			PW 43,000	C 780,000	E 140,000
15	Classroom Bldg 5	Lec 800			PW 100,000	C 1,800,000	E 220,000
16	Outdoor PE Facilities	--			PW 400,000		
17	Convert Science IV	--			PW 30,000	C 540,000	E 125,000
18	Utilities 1978	--				WC 375,000	
	TOTAL ANNUAL		20,064,000	4,845,000	5,651,000	8,470,000	1,285,000
	TOTAL, FIVE YEARS		40,315,000				

A = Acquisition E = Equipment W = Working Drawings C = Construction
P = Preliminary Plans
*Requested as part of Trustees' Budget and not included in the campus totals.

ATTACHMENT VI-A

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

PROPOSED FIVE-YEAR MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM --
EXPLANATORY DATA

The Five Year Capital Improvement Program is required annually by the Trustees and must be submitted to them on or before April 25, 1974. The attached display sheet represents those projects that have been included in previous capital outlay programs and those projects that because of expressed needs have been added by the staff. It is important to point out that the document is in draft form and consultation and input from the various campus groups is desired. Listed below is a brief explanation of each of the items, listed by priority number. The costs of the various projects are shown displayed through the future funding years and, assuming state funding in the years requested, the projects will be available for use generally the year immediately preceding the first equipment budget year.

1. Crandall Gymnasium and Natatorium Rehabilitation: The 1974-75 proposed Governor's Budget includes some \$20,000 for working drawing funds to provide for structural rehabilitation and remodel of the Crandall Gymnasium and Natatorium complex. The University had decided to continue to use the Crandall Gym complex as the permanent facility for women's physical education. The existing building and the annex will be supplemented by a future facility to provide for the necessary physical education space for women.
2. Architecture Classroom Building: Construction funds for this project were appropriated in the 1973-74 budget year and, assuming design modifications can be accomplished, the project will be rebid later this summer. The appropriations contained in the attached document are for two phases of equipment only.
3. Engineering South I: Construction funds are requested in the 1975-76 budget year and equipment funds in subsequent years to provide for this project to be located on the site of the old South Cafeteria. Working drawing funds were appropriated in 1971 and at this writing are being considered for reappropriation in the 1974 Budget Act.
4. Library-Faculty Office Building: Construction funds are being requested in the 1975-76 budget year, although the project must be modified in design slightly to permit the inclusion of 150 faculty office spaces brought about by a change in scope of the project last year.

Proposed Five-Year Major Capital Outlay
Program -- Explanatory Data

March 15, 1974
Page 2

5. Life Science Building: This building is envisioned as an addition to Science North and even though working drawing funds were not included in the Governor's Budget for 1974-75, the legislative analyst's office has recommended that they be included and on that basis we are optimistically requesting construction funds in 1975-76. The completion of this building will provide for the total instructional needs of the life science disciplines within Science North and the new project. The vacated space in the Science Building will be converted to chemistry and physics under subsequent projects.
6. Classroom Building 3: The 1975-76 budget requests working drawing funds of \$48,000 for an approximately 15,000 square foot building, complementary to the home economics- child development programs. The proposed master plan indicates a location between the Home Economics wing of the Mathematics-Home Economics Building and the Agriculture Building.
7. Agriculture Classroom Building II: Working drawing funds in the amount of \$150,000 are being requested for the 1975-76 program to provide expansion facilities for the entire School of Agriculture and Natural Resources except agricultural engineering. The ultimate plan is to locate all of the agriculture disciplines, except agricultural engineering, in the present Erhart Agriculture Building and the Phase II project. Ultimately, soil science and veterinary science will be moved from the present Science Building to the new facility. Of significance is the fact that the building is planned for no additional lecture capacity. A recent change in utilization standards for lecture now generates a lecture capacity in the present Agriculture Building of in excess of 200 FTE over what the entire School of Agriculture and Natural Resources will teach in lecture at 1980. Even though lecture facilities are not assigned by discipline or school, each of the buildings have been planned to provide for a balance of lecture, laboratory, and office capacity approximately equivalent to the ultimate demands of the particular discipline or disciplines served.
8. Site Development 1975: This project will repeat previous requests to relocate the Baseball Field, to extend Mount Bishop Road from the railroad overcrossing easterly to Parking Lot S-10 and to provide other traffic improvements.
9. Remodel Library: This project, anticipated for working drawing requests in 1976, provides for the conversion of the existing Library for additional instructional capacity, primarily for the disciplines of architecture and art.

No specific program has been written for this remodel but it is anticipated that such a program will be required approximately this time next year. This project has been phased so that the construction funds will be available approximately at the completion of the new Library facility so that the remodeling can be undertaken as soon as possible.

10. Convert Science III: With the completion of the Life Sciences Building, the biological sciences disciplines will be relocated and the space vacated will be converted primarily to chemistry and possibly some physics. Here again, the timing is set so that the construction funds for the remodel work will be available at the completion of the Life Sciences Project.
11. Women's Physical Education Addition: With the decision to continue to use the Crandall Gymnasium for women's physical education, additional facilities must be provided to satisfy the demands for the women's physical education program. The proposed master plan identifies the site in the general vicinity of the Old Power Plant as a possible location for this structure.
12. Site Development 1976: This project provides for the extension of California Boulevard, its connection with the North Outer Perimeter Road, and the construction of a traffic interchange in the confluence of California Boulevard and Highland Drive at the Southern Pacific railroad overcrossing.
13. Engineering South II: The final engineering facility will provide for the remaining disciplines in the School of Engineering and Technology. A program for this project has not yet been developed but, based upon FTE projections, related needs and existing capacities, it is anticipated that the project will have an FTE count of approximately 155.
14. Physical Education Facilities: This project provides for the construction of the second outdoor swimming pool in the area master planned for it within the men's physical education pool enclosure. In addition, because of the decision not to construct the Women's Physical Education Building and the fact that that building also contained additional shower and locker facilities for men, these functions will now be contained in a new structure yet to be sited. In addition, it is anticipated that certain specialized physical education instructional facilities will also be programmed in this project.

15. Classroom Building 5: This will be the last addition to the campus of capacity and will provide for general lecture capacity of approximately 800 FTE. It is planned to be located in the vicinity of the old athletic track and will act as a complementary facility to the Business Administration and Education Building; in all probability the two major disciplines contained within the existing building will be separated, one remaining in the existing plant and the other moving to Classroom Building 5.
16. Outdoor Physical Education Facilities: With the retention of Crandall Gymnasium, certain additional outdoor physical education areas are required to complement the women's physical education program. These will include general play fields and tennis and other courts.
17. Convert Science IV: The completion of the Agriculture Classroom Building II will permit the remodeling of the A-wing of the Science Building from soil science and veterinary science to additional facilities for the physical sciences.
18. Utilities 1978: This utility project will provide for an alternate electrical energy source to all of the academic and support facilities on the campus, thereby creating a much more reliable means of powering the facilities.